

2634
d

IN THE UNITED STATES
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

PATENT APPLICATION

Ralf Dohmen
Herbert Haunstein
Achim Herzberger
Georg Roell
Christoph Schulien
Konrad Sticht

CASE 2-3-4-2-2-2

Serial No. 10/054551 Group Art Unit 2634

Filed January 22, 2002

Examiner L. Wong

Title Adjustment Of Equalization Parameters In Receivers

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. BOX 1450
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450

SIR:

Enclosed is an Amendment and Information Disclosure Statement with a one-month Petition for Extension of Time in the above-identified application.

NO ADDITIONAL FEE REQUIRED

In the event of non-payment or improper payment of a required fee, the Commissioner is authorized to charge or to credit **Deposit Account No. 12-2325** as required to correct the error.

Respectfully,

Julio A. Garceran
Reg. No. 37,138
(908) 582-7294

Date: 7/14/05

Docket Administrator (Room 3J-219)
Lucent Technologies Inc.
101 Crawfords Corner Road
Holmdel, NJ 07733-3030

Date of Deposit July 15, 2005

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date indicated above.

Catherine F. Dugan
Printed name of person mailing paper

Signature of person mailing paper



**IN THE UNITED STATES
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Patent Application

Inventor(s) Ralf Dohmen
Herbert Haunstein
Achim Herzberger
Georg Roell
Christoph Schulien
Konrad Sticht
Case 2-3-4-2-2-2
Serial No. 10/054,551 Group Art 2634
File Date January 22, 2002
Examiner Wong, Linda
Title Adjustment Of Equalization Parameters In Receivers

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS AND TRADEMARK
WASHINGTON, DC 20231

Dear Sir:

AMENDMENT

In response to the Office Action dated April 8, 2005, please consider the following remarks on the above-identified patent application as follows.

Introductory Comments:

In the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that the document number 39901 in the Information Disclosure Statement is incorrect.

The Examiner objected to claim 1 because of an informality.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. section 112, second paragraph as being indefinite due to the misnumbering of the claims which are being considered claims 1-8 as suggested by the Examiner. The Examiner also rejected claims 1 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. section 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application No. 2005/0008070 to Wang et al. (“Wang”) and “Computer Communications,” IEEE Vol. 2, No. 4, August 1979 (“IEEE reference”). The Examiner rejected claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang and the IEEE reference and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,226,323 to Tan et al. (“Tan”). The Examiner objected to claims 2, 3, 6, 7 and 8 as being dependent from a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.